DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 348 742 EA 024 201

AUTHOR Glenn, Charles L.
TITLE School Choice: Doing It Right. Answers for Policymakers.
INSTITUTION Massachusetts State Dept. of Education, Quincy.
PUB DATE Feb 91
NOTE 43p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; Admission (School); Educational Opportunities; Elementary Secondary Education; Eligibility; *Equal Education; Nontraditional Education; *Parent Participation; *Public Schools; *School Choice; State Government; *State School District Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

Twenty-four questions regarding school choice concerns are answered in this document, which advocates school choice in public schools for Massachusetts. The following issues are included: the rationale for school choice; drawbacks to currently available choice options; components of an effective choice plan; the definition and maintenance of common standards and accountability; the impact of choice on teaching; administration and transportation; parental decision-making information; and maintenance of racial balance. The elements of a public education system based on diversity and choice within individual school systems and state- or region-wide plans are described. The roles of the school board, superintendent, principal, and state government in school choice are also examined. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SA

Massachusetts Department of Education

Office of Educational Equity

ED348742

school choice: doing it right

Answers for Policy-makers

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. Reynolds, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

February 1991

EA 024201

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

school choice: doing it right

Answers for Policy-makers

Charles L. Glenn, Executive Director
Office of Educational Equity
Massachusetts Department of Education

1. Why should we be concerned about parent choice of schools?

There are several reasons, both pedagogical and more broadly cultural, for the growing concern to make public school choice available to more parents. The pedagogical reasons include:

* students have different needs and strengths; they think and learn in different ways

* schools are more effective if they have a clear educational mission, a coherent approach to instruction

* we need to find ways to release the energy and creativity of educators by creating professional teaching conditions

* students learn more in schools and programs that they and their parents have chosen

Over the past twenty years education has been marked by a growing awareness that students have different needs and strengths.

To take one example, students with "special needs" used to be grouped together in classes for what were referred to as "backward and subnormal children," with little assessment of their actual needs or their potential to benefit from aspects of the regular curriculum. Today we take for granted that an individualized educational plan is in the best interest of each "special needs" student, and many press to give every student a right to such tailor-made treatment.

Parents tend to agree strongly with this pedagogical strategy. Surveys in several cities have found "individualized instruction" one of the most appealing alternatives; parents are well aware that even siblings have very different needs and strengths.

The graded school, in which all children of a given age are treated essentially alike, is a relatively recent development. Some historians relate this to the rise of the factory system of manufacturing, as an attempt to make more rational and systematic the provision of educational services. We have come to understand, even in manufacturing, that an approach that permits more flexible work by individuals and groups may be far more effective. Most schools now provide various alternatives to whole-group instruction.

There is a limit to the diversity of approaches possible--or desirable--in a single school. Effective schools research suggests that schools should become more coherent, each school informed by a single clear educational philosophy that is shared by all concerned. Research and experience have not identified a single approach that is most effective under all circumstances and for all students; almost any well-developed pedagogy is preferable to the confusion of trying a little bit of everything with no clear direction. Parent choice permits schools to become more different one from another, so long as they satisfy some parents very much.

Perhaps the essential key to excellence in public education is the creation of conditions of teaching that both expect and permit teachers to behave as professional educators. The influential

Carnegie Report on Teaching as a Profession urges that the teachers in a school (with their principal) be given the autonomy to develop a distinctive approach to their educational mission. Only through such autonomy can teaching become a true profession, and schools become "exciting places for both teachers and students." But if public schools become distinctive, parents must be allowed to choose among them--or we will see increasing dissatisfaction and conflict, leading to pressures for a return to cautious standardization!

Experience also suggests that students show more commitmen to programs and schools that they have chosen. Albert Shanker of the American Federation of Teachers told the National Governors' Association that "attendance is much higher and dropout rates are much lower in those public schools--vocational and option academic high schools--that students themselves have chosen to go to." Similarly, a student leader in Massachusetts told the State Board that learning to choose is an important aspect of education, and one to which school systems often give too little scope.

In addition to these pedagogical concerns, there are several developments in the wider society that put school choice on the agenda of most critical issues in education. These include

* parents expect to be able to choose schools--and do!

* there is growing conflict over the goals of schooling

Americans expect to be able to choose where they will live, what kind of work they will do, where they will shop and what brands they will select, what car they will drive, even how they will send packages or make telephone calls. We are a society of consumers, and we put considerable effort and skill into making sound consumer choices. It should not be surprising that we expect to make choices about the schools our children will attend.

Options already exist for millions of parents as they decide where to live or make use of non-public schools; choice of schools is exercised on a massive scale by those who can afford it.

Conflict over the goals of schooling divides many communities, and has led to the establishment of thousands of alternative, non-governmental schools in recent decades. Some of this conflict is explicitly religious, but much can better be described as cultural: Americans have different views over such matters as whether education consists primarily of teaching children a tradition or of helping them to draw upon their own inner resources.

The response of public schools to conflict over values and over the goals of schooling has tended to be "defensive teaching," with "the bland leading the bland." Much that gives flavor and excitement to American life and could nurture conviction and responsibility in a rising generation is excluded. At least four recent studies of textbooks have pointed out their neglect not only of religion but of altruism and self-sacrifice as well.

This is a recipe for boring and unrealistic education, and for apathetic students who will grow into apathetic citizens.

How much better it would be if parents could choose among **publicly-supported** schools that offer distinctive and coherent approaches to explicit teaching and to implicit values!

2. Where does this leave Horace Mann's ideal of the "common school"?

Why not concentrate on providing a **common education in uncommon schools**? Why not encourage public schools to be distinctively excellent in ways responding to the concerns of the

parents and the professional judgment of the teachers and the principal who work together to give each school its special quality?

Distinctive schools can provide a common education if we become more clear about the outcomes that we expect. Clarity about goals will permit us to be far more flexible about the paths followed to reach those goals. Secretary of Education Lamar Alexander, then Governor of Tennessee and writing for the National Governors' Association, described this as "horse-trading".

> The kind of horse-trading we're talking about [he wrote] will change dramatically the way most American schools work. First, the Governors want to help establish clear goals and better report cards, ways to measure what students know and can do. Then, we're ready to give up a lot of state regulatory control--even to fight for changes in the law to make that happen--if schools and school districts will be accountable for the results. We invite educators to show us where less regulation makes the most sense. These changes will require more rewards for success and consequences for failure for teachers, school leaders, schools, and school districts. It will mean giving parents more choice of the public schools their children attend as one way of assuring higher quality without heavy-handed state control.[1]

3. Aren't there complaints that students have too many choices?

Powell, Farrar and Cohen suggest, in The Shopping Mall High School that American secondary schools go too far in accommodating the desires of students for the sake of tranquillity and the appearance of success.

Many students--and especially many average students--do not

> learn. They avoid learning. The accommodation made to hold students and keep the peace permit this option. It is easy to avoid learning and still graduate. It is even easy to do so and graduate believing that one has learned. Avoidance can be wrapped in brightly packaged illusions. Behind impressive course titles lie the realities of very different classroom treaties. Students can accumulate endless credits without taking classes committed to engaging them in the subjects they are supposed to be studying. Nor are they pressed to engage in the realm of character and conduct. Most seem satisfied with this arrangement.[2]

This criticism deserves to be taken very seriously indeed, but it does not discredit choice in itself. There has been a failure to develop and apply clear standards to assure that each choice offered is a serious educational option. A study by Beverly Miyares of Massachusetts high schools reveals the wide variation in the meaning and content of courses that ostensibly cover the same material. Simply requiring that students take certain courses, then, may bear very little relation to assuring that each student masters essential skills and knowledge.

A subtle form of "tracking" has reappeared, then, and creates the illusion that students are receiving the same education while in fact what is taught and learned varies widely from community to community as well as within schools. The result is a cheapening of the diploma as an indication that students have in fact grappled with serious intellectual challenges. "The schools have done a masterful job at selling the importance of high school attendance, but have failed in the attempt to sell to most students the value of working hard to learn to use one's mind."

Any sound program of educational choice will assure that each of the options offered is solidly-anchored in explicit goals for student learning. This is very different from insisting --as some current proposals suggest--that every student learn **in the same way** or by

using the same curriculum.

4. Don't parents have choices already?

There is very extensive choice among schools already. Millions of parents choose private or parochial schools out of the conviction that their children will receive a better education and/or an education corresponding more closely to their own convictions. Between 1970 and 1985 the enrollment in such schools, kindergarten through eighth grade, rose by 6% while public school enrollment was declining by 17%! This does not take into account home schooling and religious schools that refuse to report their enrollments.

Parents also choose through decisions about where they will live; real estate agents expect to have to answer questions about the quality of schooling in different attendance districts and communities, and corporate relocation decisions frequently take the availability of good schools into account. Such choices have become very significant in a period of high residential mobility.

Within school systems there usually exist many opportunities for sophisticated or well-connected parents to determine where their children will go to school. White parents are quick to abandon their "neighborhood schools," for example, when racial change begins to occur. Some school systems have policies of "open enrollment" on a space-available basis.

There is nothing wrong with this, in principle, since we are a free society in which the right of parents to control the education of their children is legally established. Unfortunately, parent choice generally operates in the absence of well-considered policies to maximize its advantages and minimize its disadvantages.

Here are some of the drawbacks to choice as it presently operates:

(1) the opportunity to choose is frequently dependent upon personal resources or membership in a particular religious community;

(2) it is arbitrary in the sense that some individuals may be favored over others because of connections or access to information or race or simply blind luck; and

(3) it tends to lead to a progressive abandonment of the less-favored schools and of children whose parents are, for any of the reasons mentioned above, unable to make effective use of educational options.

5. What would be the elements of a system of public education based on diversity and choice within individual school systems?

System-wide choice may take several forms. The first is simply the adoption of a policy (often called open enrollment) that allows parents to seek a transfer, subject to space availability and--where applicable--to desegregation requirements.

The second is the designation of a number of schools as "magnet schools" that seek to draw some or all of their enrollment system-wide, subject to specific admission policies. Note a distinction: a magnet school may enroll all of its students voluntarily, or it may have an attendance district but also draw a specified number of students from outside that district.

Magnet schools, permitting choice for the most sophisticated and motivated parents, may keep their children within public education,

and in fact provide them with the superior instruction, but have no general effect of improving the quality of schooling. For other parents and **their** children, those "left behind," the result may be social class or racial isolation in a school of lowered expectations.

The third form of choice abolishes residential attendance districts and requires all the parents of all children new to the school system to indicate one or more choices. Assignments are then made based on a variety of criteria that--ideally--are clearly stated and universally understood.

The advantage of the third approach is that it can have the effect of improving education overall, for every student in each school.

Under a policy of universal choice, it is in the interest of everyone to assure that no school is clearly inferior to others. A school with such a reputation attracts few applicants, necessitating mandatory assignments. While the classic "neighborhood school" is in fact enrolled by mandatory assignments based upon residence, the element of compulsion emerges much more clearly when parents have first been offered a choice. Vaguely dissatisfied parents are one thing, directly disappointed parents another! Thus the entire school system develops a stake in making each school of generally equal quality and reputation.

The most consistent such approach is the controlled choice policy under which the public schools attended by more than 145,000 Massachusetts students now operate. Unlike "winner-take-all, devil-take-the-hindmost" strategies of competition among schools, the Massachusetts system of controlled choice seeks to provide comparable benefits to **all** pupils and also to increase the effective participation of low-income and minority children and their parents in the process of education, while stimulating every school (not just a few magnet schools) to become more effective.

Controlled choice works like this: automatic assignment of pupils to schools on the basis of where they live is abolished, and the parents of children new to the school system or moving to the next level of schooling receive information and (if they wish) counseling about all options before indicating preferences. Assignments are then made that satisfy these preferences so far as is consistent with available capacities and local policies and requirements, which may include desegregation.

The goal has been to extend the benefits of choice -- amply demonstrated by the magnet schools -- to all schools and all pupils, with four objectives:

(1) to give all pupils in a community (or in a geographical section of a larger city) equal access to every public school, not limited by where their families can afford to live;

(2) to involve all parents (not just the most sophisticated) in making informed decisions about where their children will go to school;

(3) to create pressure for the improvement, over time, of every school through eliminating guaranteed enrollment on the basis of residence; and

(4) **where necessary**, to achieve racial desegregation of every school with as few mandatory assignments as possible.

Policies that make choice the only basis for school attendance can be far more positive in their overall effect than partial choice through magnet schools or open enrollment. The impact of social class on opportunity is neutralized and every school, over time, is impelled to become more effective--or to go out of business.

6. What makes a system of choice work effectively?

A well-designed strategy for putting choice to work for educational reform must include three elements:

(a) procedures to assure equal access unlimited by race, wealth or influence, to maintain confidence in the fairness of the admission process, and (where required by law or sought as a matter of policy) to promote the racial integration of each school;

(b) effective outreach and individual counseling to assure that as high a proportion as possible of parents make conscious, informed decisions about the schools that will serve their children well; and

(c) measures to assure that there are real educational choices:

(1) removal of bureaucratic requirements that limit new approaches desired by parents and teachers,

(2) help to schools that are not able to attract applications,

(3) leadership and other changes (perhaps closing and reopening with totally new staff and focus) if such schools do not change over time, and

(4) opportunities for groups of teachers, parents, or others to initiate additional alternatives within or outside existing structures, with public support.

Controlled choice provides a framework--and a powerful incentive--for bringing together these elements in a powerful combination with school-based management and pedagogical reform.[3]

Obviously a "super school" with massive additional resources will find it easy to attract parents. Even without such an advantage,

however, an option can be strongly appealing if it has a clearly-defined educational mission which is communicated effectively. Curiously, for many parents the precise nature of that mission is less important than a sense that the school staff knows where it is going with children and how to get there.

This clarity of mission may be achieved by a school leader able to gain support for a personal vision, or by one who works to elicit a consensus from the staff. What does not work-- unless these qualities are already present--is for central administration (or a court) simply to designate schools to be "magnets" with specified themes.

Development of an attractive option can also be frustrated by demands for system-wide uniformity in non-essentials, or by instability of staffing. Several magnet schools in Boston which experienced little difficulty during the "busing" controversies were then devastated by staff lay-offs and bumping.

An individual option may work very well but have a negative effect on the school system as a whole, and on the majority of children, if the result is simply to drain resources--the most skilled and creative teachers, energetic leaders, involved parents--away from other schools. A deliberate program of choice avoids this negative result by incorporating a clear overall strategy of "orchestrated diversity and choice," that supports both equity and system-wide school improvement; choice should never be developed in isolation from the instructional goals of the school system.

7. What would be the elements of a region-wide or state-wide system based on diversity and choice?

It is relatively simply to organize a system allowing parents to choose schools within the school system where they are resident,

but more complicated issues arise when inter-district transfers are to be encouraged. There are ample precedents, including

* districts frequently admit non-residents on a tuition- paying basis, with the costs paid by parents or by a school unable to provide a suitable program; Arizona, Colorado, Iowa and Vermont provide state support for such educational transfers

* special needs services provided on an inter-district basis, especially for low-incidence populations; for example, one school system may serve hearing-impaired and another vision-impaired students

* educational collaboratives and regional districts for vocational education, with each system paying the costs of the students it sends

* urban/suburban desegregation programs, under which (in large part) urban minority students attend suburban schools, with some movement in the opposite direction in some cases; the Boston-area Metco Program has been in operation for over twenty years, and Milwaukee, St. Louis, and other cities have implemented urban/suburban transfers

Each of these approaches raises school finance issues that would have to be addressed within the context of state programs of assistance.

Inter-district transfers also raise in an acute form the problem of protecting the interests of **all** students. The small high school that cannot provide honors programs loses its brightest students to another system; what is the impact upon the quality of education for the students who are left behind? A school district that is already financially marginal loses the state aid for students who transfer out; how will it educate the remaining students, in classes of an uneconomical size? Neighboring communities begin to

compete fiercely for students, knowing that eventually one high school (and its athletic teams!) will have to be disbanded.

Such problems have arisen countless times, of course, in the process of school district consolidation over the past sixty years, ever since the school bus became made it possible. That does not make them any less painful.

State leadership should encourage the development of "regional compacts" governing parent choices among a number of schools and districts. Such locally-negotiated agreements, rather than state-wide policies, are most likely to be effective. One example would be an agreement that one high school will offer advanced science courses, another advanced language courses, another a particularly strong program in the arts. Each could provide a stronger program in a specialized area than it could if trying to meet the needs of all academically-talented students.

The role of state policy would be limited to assuring that the overall impact is equitable for all types of students, and that common educational standards are met.

8. How can common standards be defined and maintained?

The extension of parent choice--if it is combined with encouraging school diversity to make that choice meaningful--complicates the task of assuring that common standards are met in all publicly-supported schools. The problem is by no means without precedent, however. States must already wrestle with the wide range of freedom that local districts have in defining their approach to meeting educational standards, as well as with the supervision of highly diverse non-public schools.

How do we define those elements of education that must be "common," that every student should master? We have been able to avoid facing this question clearly, by and large, because of our assumption that we provide a uniform education in all elementary schools. As we encourage diversity among public schools, it becomes increasingly important to be clear about where we will **not** encourage diversity, where in fact we will give more attention to assuring that students learn certain things in common.

This will involve a recognition that the essence of a common education is not the school schedule, or class size, or books, or pedagogical strategy, but rather that **students learn certain things in common**. Doing everything the same in schools, as at present, leads **demonstrably** to very different results, to a failure to provide a common education. Doing things very differently in different schools, according to the needs of students, the goals and values of parents, and the gifts of teachers, may paradoxically lead to that common education which we have been seeking in vain through uniformity of schooling since Horace Mann.

It will achieve this only if we can become much clearer about what we expect, stated in terms of proficiencies rather than of procedures, and then have the courage to hold schools accountable for results rather than for the ways in which they reach these results, provided there is no abuse of pupils or of their right not to be discriminated against.

Several nations of Western Europe are wrestling with this question of defining the basic or common skills and knowledge that every student within the normal ability range should without exception master for life in society. Rather than stating this in terms of a given number of course credits, they are focusing on necessary competencies. This process is **essential** to the creation of a system of education which is equitable in the sense that it encourages individuals to go as far as their abilities permit, while providing an education in common in those things that every

student should learn.

The more effectively this task is carried out--and it is one faced by our states as well--the more comfortable we can feel about encouraging public school choice. Standards are maintained by assuring that each school does at least an adequate job of teaching the skills and knowledge that have been centrally defined as essential at each age-level. Definition of such common proficiencies is central to the plan for comprehensive reform of secondary education in Boston, adopted in January 1991,

9. What is the impact of parent choice on the professional life of teachers?

Perhaps the most essential key to real excellence in public education is the creation of conditions of teaching that both expect and permit teachers to behave as professional educators. The Carnegie Report on teachers stresses the importance of allowing them, working together, to exercise autonomy in defining the mission of the school:

> One of the most attractive aspects of professional work is the way professionals are treated in the workplace. Professionals are presumed to know what they are doing, and are paid to exercise their judgment. Schools on the other hand operate as if consultants, school district experts, textbook authors, trainers, and distant officials possess more relevant expertise than the teachers in the schools. Bureaucratic management of schools proceeds from the view that teachers lack the talent or motivation to think for themselves. Properly staffed schools can only succeed if they operate on the principle that the essential resource is already inside the school: determined, intelligent and capable teachers. Such schools will be

characterized by autonomy for the school as a whole and collegial relationships among its faculty.

Professional autonomy. Professional autonomy is the first requirement. If the schools are to compete successfully with medicine, architecture, and accounting for staff, then teachers will have to have comparable authority in making the key decisions about the services they render. Within the context of a limited set of clear goals for students set by state and local policymakers, teachers, working together, must be free to exercise their professional judgment as to the best way to achieve these goals. This means the ability to make--or at least to strongly influence--decisions concerning such things as the materials and instructional methods to be used, the staffing structure to be employed, the organization of the school day, the assignment of students, the consultants to be used, and the allocation of resources available to the school.[4]

There is good reason to believe that increased parent choice will **enhance** the professionalism of teaching, and thus the personal and financial rewards of being a teacher. Albert Shanker has supported parent choice for this reason. Teachers who are able to define their services in a more specialized way as a result of the diversification of public school options will have taken a step that has been crucial for the development of other professions.

10. What is the impact of parent choice on the rights of teachers?

Any choice policy that ignores the rights and legitimate interests of teachers will not work to strengthen public education, though it may satisfy a few parents at the expense of many children. After all, teachers who are treated unfairly or fear that parent choice

will undermine their position are not going to take the lead in making schools more diverse, more flavorful, more effective.

In some parts of the country teacher organizations have expressed fears that programs of choice would undermine their hard-won rights. There can be no question that **any** change in the allocation of employment opportunities has the potential of causing complications. It is well to keep in mind that (a) changes are continually occurring in any case, as parents exercise their choices and as new demands lead to a shifting of program emphasis, and (b) enhanced parent satisfaction can only stabilize if not reverse the decline in public school enrollments.

Teacher contracts ordinarily contain provisions governing the process by which teachers are laid off, transferred, promoted, and in other respects affected in their conditions of employment. There is no **necessary** conflict between a system of school assignment resting upon choice and the full implementation of any teacher contract.

If the residential enrollment in an attendance district declines--as has been more the rule than the exception in many parts of the country--there is likely to be an impact upon the required staffing of the school. This impact is mediated, in most cases, through a teacher contract. If the enrollment grows in another part of the same school system, teachers "bumped" from the first school will often have a right to positions at the second. Population shifts attributable to choice are not inherently different from population shifts attributable to birthrates, the development of housing, or economic conditions. In Massachusetts no teacher contract controversy has **ever** arisen in connection with choice programs under which over 200,000 students now attend public schools selected by their parents.

The area of greatest sensitivity has to do with "schools of choice" whose themes are sufficiently distinctive that a uniquely qualified

staff is necessary. Teachers who have a seniority right to work in a particular school may not have the necessary qualifications. To some extent this issue can be avoided by defining very specifically in staff job descriptions the skills and experience required. A third grade teacher, for example, may have **additional** responsibilities that make her not interchangeable with other third grade teachers. Generally speaking, the key is the definition of objective requirements and an open process of staff selection.

The protection of teacher rights and interests is one among many reasons that school choice should operate under comprehensive policies and evolving plans that seek to meet the concerns of all who will be affected. Simply opening the door to individual transfers from school to school can benefit the few at the expense of the many--including teachers. Involving teachers from the start in developing a comprehensive approach to strengthening every school through diversity and choice can maximize benefits to everyone. Experience shows that teacher organizations are far more flexible about what contracts require if they are involved from the start in identifying the goals and the contract issues.

11. What is the role of the school board or school committee?

The local elected (or, in some cases, appointed) school board is the first line of defense for fairness among schools. Since diversity and choice imply the abandonment of efforts to make every school in a system as much the same as every other school, the board will need to assure that each school has an equal chance to be attractive and effective. This will inevitably require subtle judgments, in which the views of parents must have significant weight.

The first "magnet school" in one city was a small and old facility in a minority neighborhood that, without any additional resources, managed to attract children from outside its assignment district because white parents came to appreciate the caring spirit of the school. How could you quantify that? When it was threatened with closing on rational administrative grounds, it was the school board that was able to respond to the "irrational"--but valid--reasons why it should be retained.

The school board can also help the superintendent to assure that a full range of educational options exist in the various schools under its jurisdiction. Often one or two themes will become fashionable among staff and the more outspoken parents, and a school board will have to ask whether the concerns of all parents and the needs of all students have been taken into consideration.

One way to assure that the full range of concerns has been taken into account is through the use of parent surveys that offer choices among a number of well-described alternatives. The responses of parents can then be used to estimate how many volunteers there would be for schools with particular program emphases.

12. What is the role of the superintendent in making parent choice work?

The superintendent, as chief educational leader, has to assure that educational balance is maintained in the school system.

This means that there should be "something for everybody" in the school system, not just options for the most influential parents

It means, also, that each school should provide a balanced diet of education, not become so specialized that essential parts of the

curriculum are neglected. Students should not experience serious difficulties if, for any reason, they transfer to another school. With the high mobility of modern life, it may be the exception rather than the rule that students go through all of the grades in a single elementary or secondary school. While a system of choice can reduce the impact of such unavoidable changes by allowing a parent to "shop around" for the available school closest in approach to what the student has grown accustomed to, it must not unfit students to adapt to a very different approach if that is unavoidable. The superintendent may have to restrain the enthusiasm of staff and parents in some cases in the interest of the common essentials of education.

The superintendent is also responsible for allocating resources fairly--which may not always mean equally--among schools.

It is the superintendent who will give teachers and principals the message (explicit or unspoken) that they are free to exercise a reasonable autonomy in making their schools distinctively excellent.

It is also the superintendent (as instructional leader) who will have to decide whether school- level autonomy is being exercised responsibly.

13. What is the role of the principal in making a "school of choice" work?

A principal who is arbitrary or passive and uninspiring will not be effective in leading a school that can no longer rely upon mandatory assignments to fill up its seats. A system of parent choice places a premium on school-level leadership, on a clear vision for educational excellence, even on a kind of entrepreneurial spirit. Some principals are not able to give such leadership.

The effective principal of a school of choice will involve all members of the staff and active parents in defining the distinctiveness of the school, what marks it already as different, and how that can be built upon to provide an even better education. Such a planning process will draw upon information about what some parents want very much for their children; it will not try to be all things to all parents.

It is not appropriate to say, "We're better than other schools;" recruitment should operate on the basis of a clearly-defined claim to meet the needs of particular children, while acknowledging that other children may be served better by other schools.

The principal needs to recognize that some parents whose children are currently in the school may be attracted away by another option, and that this is all right. The school team should have enough confidence in the particular direction that they have chosen to accept that this will not be best for every child or satisfactory to every parent.

Some teachers might also find other schools closer to their own ideas about the ideal teaching situation, and should be allowed and encouraged to transfer. The goal of an overall system of choice, after all, is that every child, parent and teacher find a situation to which she can be whole-heartedly committed.

Once an educational mission has been clearly defined, the principal--working with the teachers--will reorganize and enrich instruction to enhance the distinctiveness of the school.

Preferably, this will not be through add-on programs that only a few children will take part in, but through developing a flavor and an instructional strategy that make the school different. The goal is not to create a "super school" loaded with everything imaginable, but rather a school that satisfies enough parents very much because it reflects their goals and concerns for their children.

14. How does accountability work in a system of school choice?

Critics fret that choice will lower standards of accountability by substituting the judgment of pparents for that of administrators, but there is reason to believe that it can resolve a problem that we have failed to solve in centrally- controlled school systems.

Public education does a poor job of requiring accountability for educational results and for the difficult-to-measure qualities that make schools satisfactory to parents and effective in the development of character and the support of individual gifts. In general, only the most bizarre behavior on the part of a teacher or principal will result in loss of a position.

Teachers are understandably resistant to evaluation based upon student outcomes over which they may feel they have little control, given the cumulative nature of learning, or upon the persistant complaints of a single parent. They may feel that their success with the "whole child" is not well measured by tests of a reading or arithmetic.

Principals argue that, constrained as they are by detailed requirements and having limited power to hire or fire staff, they should not be held accountable for school-wide results.

Parent choice offers an approach to accountability that starts from a very different assumption: that over time and in the aggregate parents are well able to judge whether a school is meeting the needs of their children.

One aspect of such judgments is achievement in relation to state-defined objectives, and such information needs to be made available regularly. But parents are also capable of factoring in, as no "objective" evaluation can, the needs of an individual child:

is she being challenged enough, is he doing as well as can be expected given difficulties at home, is she growing and learning in many ways which are not reflected on the tests? By "voting with their [children's] feet," parents exercise a much more subtle and comprehensive form of evaluation than education officials have been able to devise.

This "parent evaluation," though it is based on experience with individual teachers, is finally a judgment for or against a school. There are several consequences. The teacher is "on the spot," but as part of a team, and the principal as leader is challenged to organize instruction so as to use the strengths and minimize the weaknesses of each member of the team. The terrible isolation so many teachers complain about is lessened by the fact that the staff of a school stands or falls together.

Evaluation by the choices of parents is particularly effective in situations where declining enrollments make school closings likely. In several cities this prospect, in the context of a policy of parent choice, has galvanized efforts to make a school distinctively attractive.

15. What are the implications of a system of choice for the school that few parents select?

The answer to the unpopularity of a school is not to force children to attend it! The answer is to make the school better, and more attractive. "Better" may include the quality of academic instruction, but there are some high-scoring schools that still manage to repell parents because of intangibles of atmosphere, approaches to discipline, attitude toward children and toward parents. There are secondary schools that can fairly be called unfriendly and even dangerous environments for teenagers.

In a sense, the fact that discussions of choice always seem to come back to the unattractive school shows how important it is that we discuss choice! We may grow complacent about the fact that we have such schools, so long as they enjoy a "captive audience." A system of choice is the best possible impetus for all concerned to work very hard to make every school acceptable to parents--if not as their first choice, then as an alternative.

Helping a school to become more appealing to parents and students may require additional resources. It may require a change in the attitude of leadership. It may require assistance in making the school a safe and attractive environment for learning. It may--and almost always does--require additional staff time to identify areas of strength that can be built upon and to work together as a team. As the Carnegie Report urged,

> Fundamental to our conception of a workable professional environment that fosters learning is more time for all professional teachers to reflect, plan, and discuss teaching innovations and problems with their colleagues. Providing this additional time requires additional staff to support the professional teachers, technology that relieves teachers of much routine instructional and administrative work, a radical reorganization of work roles to make the most efficient use of staff in a collegial environment, and a new approach to the use of space.

School staff must be given resources and other support to make their school attractive to parents and students, over several years. They must be given the opportunity to tell their story, to reach parents with the message that the school is changing for the better in a variety of ways. They must begin by satisfying the parents whose children are already in the school, since they will be the most effective witnesses to other parents.

As a last resort, the persistent unwillingness of parents-- given a choice--to enroll their children in certain schools should force the

superintendent and school board to make some tough decisions. Does the school need a new principal? Is the facility or location hopeless? Should some or all of the faculty be encouraged to transfer, and an all-volunteer faculty be assigned to the school? Would a partnership with a university, or business, or cultural institution bring new energies into the school?

In short, a system of parent choice creates an opportunity to identify those schools that need some kind of "shot in the arm." Standardized test scores are an important measure, of course, but they are too easily explained away as the result of the social class of the students. Parent choice, over time and with adequate opportunities for parents to learn about each option, can be an effective indicator of many of the intangibles that are an important part of any school.

16. Will parent choice lead to racial segregation?

Choice can work strongly **against** racial balance, when it does not include appropriate safeguards. Any school system with a significant number of minority students should take great care that its choice policies do not lead to increased segregation, and thus perhaps to litigation and court-ordered desegregation.

One of the principal liability findings in Boston and other lawsuits which have led to comprehensive desegregation orders has been that the school system had allowed white parents to use open enrollment to escape from their "neighborhood schools" in racially-changing areas. The de facto segregation caused by residential patterns turned into de jure segregation furthered by school system policies, and thus led to an obligation to implement desegregation plans.

The Supreme Court placed a heavy burden of proof on "freedom of choice" plans in the South, finding that they tended to reinforce existing racial separation. With Fourteenth Amendment litigation an ever-present possibility in many school systems--and the state always a co-defendant--devising a program of choice is a highly sensitive task.

The controlled choice method of pupil assignments was developed as a means of achieving effective and stable desegregation while satisfying the choices of parents to the greatest possible extent.

Under Boston's previous desegregation plan, approximately 25 percent of the system's pupils attended magnet schools on the basis of choice, while the remainder--many unsuccessful applicants to magnet schools--were assigned without choice on the basis of where they lived. By contrast, the entry-level grades assigned under controlled choice last year and this year are **more** desegregated than was the case before, and the great majority of these pupils were assigned to schools that their parents had indicated were acceptable: 85 percent of the first graders, 87 percent of the sixth graders, and 91 percent of the ninth graders in Boston were assigned to schools that had been selected by their parents, and in most cases to their first choices.

Of Boston's fifteen high schools, six had no freshmen assigned involuntarily this year, while in some cases having many disappointed applicants. On the other hand, seven other Boston high schools did not attract enough applicants of any racial/ethnic category to fill their available places in the ninth grade voluntarily, even if race were not a consideration in making assignments.

These mandatory assignments were necessary because, after increasing the assignable capacity of the more popular schools in order to accommodate as many students as possible, there remained hundreds without school places. Desegregation considerations did not "compromise choice;" choice was unfortunately denied to some

without regard to race, creed, or color and they were assigned to schools they had not chosen because of space limitations elsewhere in the system.

There was only one Boston high school out of fifteen to which freshmen of one racial/ethnic category were assigned involuntarily while those of another who had made it their first choice were denied admission, in order to meet desegregation requirements.

The fact that students of all racial/ethnic categories must be assigned involuntarily because of an insufficient supply of places in acceptable schools is deplorable. Keep in mind, however, that Boston, like other school systems, has **always** assigned students to these same schools. Choice has not changed that reality; it has simply brought it into a sharp focus that creates pressure both to improve or close those schools and also to allow other entrants into the educational marketplace.

Even if desegregation were not a concern -- as it must be in Boston because of a past history of intentional segregation -- it is difficult to conceive of circumstances under which all pupils could be assigned to their parents' first choice, unless enrollment declines and budget surpluses had led to ample slack capacity in the more popular schools. Some schools will always, for a variety of reasons, attract more applicants than they are able to accommodate; this is a problem in Great Britain as well, though official policies encouraging parent choice are not subject to desegregation requirements.

A wise assignment policy will use every bit of space in the schools that parents want while leaving the schools they do **not** want under-enrolled so far as possible; over several years the more attractive options are replicated and the less attractive are improved, closed or converted unless, of course, they are already educating effectively and merely need help in presenting themselves to parents.

Altogether, only 1.7 percent of the students assigned to the entry levels of Boston schools this Fall (238 of 14,041 first, sixth and ninth graders) were either denied a place or assigned involuntarily to a place that another student was denied in order to meet the requirements of desegregation.

While there will always be an element of restriction of eligibility to attend particular schools when desegregation is a necessary consideration, good planning can reduce parent frustration by assuring that there are a sufficient number of options of each type that if a particular school is not available, an equivalent program in another school can be offered instead.

17. Should there be an absolute right to attend the "neighborhood school"?

While there can be no "property right" in attending a particular school, a neighborhood preference in assignments can do a great deal to reduce anxiety in the early stages of a system of parent choice. It can also help to reduce the transportation costs associated with choice, and to facilitate parent involvement in the school.

There are some circumstances, however, in which place of residence should not create a special right to attend a school. One case would be when a school offers a rather specialized and popular opportunity--particularly at the secondary level--and it would be unfair to give residents of one part of a community an advantage over those who live elsewhere. It would be appropriate, if there are more applicants than can be accommodated, to select those to be admitted on a random basis. Of course, some schools have admission requirements, which generally do not give a preference to residents of a particular area.

18. Can poor parents realistically take advantage of a system of school choice? What about children whose parents are overwhelmed with their own personal problems?

A common objection to programs of choice is that they will work against the interests of poor children because their parents are incapable of making sound choices for their children.

One of the ironies of this objection is that it is commonly put forward by liberals who are strong supporters of "community control" and "self-determination" by inner city residents. Somehow poor people are thought of as capable of acting collectively to advance their best interests, but not of doing so individually. The same critics of school choice often support the right of teenagers to make choices about sexual activity and abortion, while questioning whether their parents can make a wise choice among schools.

There is now extensive evidence, in cities that have implemented choice as part of desegregation plans, that many poor parents--of all racial and ethnic groups--want to make choices and are fully capable of doing so. This doesn't mean that their every choice is a good one; none of us can claim to be omniscient! But there is little evidence of widespread irrational behavior in systems like Boston, where every parent has the opportunity each year to indicate school preferences.

In the last analysis, though, it is surely the responsibility of those setting up a system of choice, whether local or inter-district, to assure that there are no **bad** choices.

The fear is sometimes expressed that charlatans will lure unsuspecting parents to volunteer their children for a shabby educational experience. Unfortunately, shabby education is all too

common in schools to which students are assigned without a choice, but it should be less likely in a system that empowers parents to use their judgment and good information to select a school. Where a publicly-supported school persists in providing an inadequate education, it is the reponsibility of local and state education authorities to intervene to protect the students, whether they are in the school by choice or not.

A final consideration is that the choice of schools and programs is an ideal opportunity for parents and teenagers to learn to weigh alternatives and make decisions. To the extent that the dependency and passivity of some poor families is a matter of concern, the creation of a system of choice in which there are real alternatives but no truly bad choices may itself offer an education in responsibility.

19. Should part-time enrollment be allowed?

There are some cases in which no one school can meet the needs or interests of parents and students. A familiar example is that of released time religious instruction. The Supreme Court has held that, while public schools may not provide religious instruction (though they may teach about religion), they may release students for a period of time each week to receive parent-approved religious instruction.

Another example repeatedly upheld by federal courts is the practice of excusal from activities that are offensive to certain students. A very different kind of example would be the part-time enrollment of a secondary student in another high school or a college to take a particular course that his or her school does not provide. In 1985 Minnesota adopted a new program under which juniors and seniors may take such courses.

In some parts of the country public schools allow parents who are practicing "home schooling" to enroll their children for those portions of the school program that they are not able to provide at home, or do not find offensive.

More complicated issues are raised by "shared time" between a public and a private school. To what extent does it constitute unconstitutional support of a religious school if its students are able to take certain courses or extra-curricular activities at a public school? Under what circumstances does the use of publicly-funded staff to provide health services or remedial education to private school students constitute government "entanglement" with religion? The law is still evolving in this area.

20. What information do parents need to have to make wise choices?

Without an effective parent information effort, the existence of school choice will benefit primarily those parents with access to unofficial information networks. The Massachusetts Department of Education has made such an effort a requirement for funding of a system-wide program of choice.

Parent information needs to function at both the school and the system level. Staff of the school--sometimes including a paid outreach worker--must define clearly and honestly what it is that is distinctive about their school, taking care not to seek to promise all things to all parents. Everyone associated with the school, including parents with children already enrolled, should understand and be able to interpret this "mission statement." A brochure should be prepared describing, with a minimum of "hype," what prospective parents can expect; if the school has specific expectations of parents, these should also be spelled out.

Prospective parents should be encouraged to visit, to ask questions, to sit in on a class, exactly as would be the case at a non-public school. Ideally, parents with children already in the school should serve as the guides on "visitation days;" teachers and administrators should be available to talk, but many parents will be more comfortable asking their real questions of other parents. In an urban context, special attention has to be given to language barriers, to transportation for parent visits, and to overcoming the hesitation that parents may have about expressing expectations.

Important as these school-level efforts are, they should not operate unchecked by system-level coordination; the goal of public school choice is not to create a free market, but to assure that **every** parent is free to choose among schools whose quality is equivalent, though their emphasis may vary widely. One way of assuring this is through school accreditation-- essentially peer review--at the elementary as well as the secondary level.

The school system should also operate a parent information center to coordinate system-wide efforts and assure that they fit together in support of a comprehensive policy. The center should approve the brochures produced by individual schools, to check for "truth in advertising," and should handle all general inquiries to the school system about assignment options.

The center should also serve as an adjunct to the office that handles new registrations for the school system. In an effective system of choice, registrations and assignments must be centralized (or handled, in a large school district, in decentralized district offices). This makes it possible to present the available options routinely to every parent registering a child, rather than only to those who are motivated (and have the necessary information and confidence) to make a special inquiry. Parent counsellors can provide individualized information and advice to each parent who comes to register a child for school.

21. Who should provide the information about school options?

It is clearly the responsibility of a school system to assure that adequate information is provided to parents about the various options available to them. This does not mean that the system should have a **monopoly** on such information.

There is an increasing trend for state departments of education to assume (or be given) the responsibility of collecting and disseminating information that allows parents to compare educational outcomes in different schools and school systems. This information is usually in the form of standardized test results, and school staff are rightly concerned that it can be misinterpreted as indicating the **quality** of the schooling provided in various schools or the **competence** of teachers. The fact is, of course, that test scores have a great deal to do with the socio-economic status of the students who are taking the tests.

The relatively quality of a maternity hospital and a hospital specializing in the treatment of life-threatening conditions could not be judged by comparing their discharge rates; they face different challenges. This is true of different schools, as well, and valid comparisons will always take into account a variety of "background factors" that affect test scores.

Another limitation of standardized tests is that they measure only a part of what education is intended to accomplish. This is why more sophisticated assessments--such as those carried out by external accrediting agencies through on-site visits by a team of professionals--can be far more valuable in providing the information that a parent would want in making a choice among educational options. While the accreditation process has traditionally involved secondary and higher education, an increasing number of school systems are inviting it for their elementary schools as well.

Information about schools is also provided, in some cases, by advocacy-oriented groups that serve as watch-dogs for the interests of students. This can be a valuable supplement to "official" information, though sometimes it is distorted by the interest of the group in stressing negative aspects of schools that should be corrected. Such an emphasis can lead to further deterioration of a school; the effort to get parents "fighting mad" in the interest of pressure for change may instead cause them to simply abandon the school for another where there seems to be less conflict. Generally speaking, parents cannot afford to believe that their children are going to a bad school, and campaigns that stress negatives are of limited value in mobilizing them for involvement.

A final--and really the most important--source of information about educational options is what parents say to other parents and students say to other students. Surveys generally show that the information that parents trust the most is the experience of other parents.

22. What are the issues in the administration and timing of a system of choice?

The enrollment of any school in our mobile society varies from year to year, and often from day to day. A policy encouraging parent choice can intensify this instability, but it can also have the opposite effect. For example, a school system may specify the number of seats available in a particular school well before the close of the preceding academic year, and recruit and place students only up to that limit. This allows for a high degree of predictability in planning for teachers and other resources.

The same approach is used in urban/suburban transfer programs, in

which the suburban system specifies each year the number of places available and their grade level. With careful planning, this can lead to an optimal pupil:teacher ratio in every classroom.

The school system may also limit the impact upon "sending schools" by where it targets recruitment and how it weights applicants in the assignment process. Springfield, Massachusetts has followed such a procedure for ten years, permitting flexible adjustments to the enrollment of each school in the system as neighborhood demographics change. Far from being a source of increased instability, a well-managed program of choice can contribute to enrollment stability and resource management.

There may be circumstances under which a school system will decide to allocate an extra staff position to a school in anticipation of successful recruitment, and even to do so during the preparatory year before voluntary enrollments begin. This additional expense is amply justified by the need to prepare a smoothly-functioning team. In contrast, at least one city encouraged certain schools to recruit additional students to promote desegregation but then provided no additional staff to maintain the previous class size--one of the attractions for parents! This short-sightedness had a blighting effect on school-level initiative: the more successful the recruitment, the more the school was penalized.

Another timing problem has to do with when parents are informed whether their assignment requests can be honored. Some school systems make assignments for the following year on a "rolling" basis, as new students are registered or transfer requests are made.

Others have set a single cut-off point, after which all requests are considered; in this way, if more eligible applications are received for a particular option than there are spaces available, a random selection can be made. The second method has the advantage of fairness, but for many parents it requires waiting for a number of weeks after they have made a choice, a particular problem for

those who need to decide whether to pay a tuition deposit for a non-public school! Recruitment is greatly facilitated by making assignments as quickly as possible, but this does tend to favor those who have better sources of information. Periodically we hear of parents camping out overnight or longer to be first to register their children for a desirable magnet school.

Under universal controlled choice, the assignment process must be handled with special care because there are no attendance districts to fall back upon. Each parent with a child entering the system or moving a higher level of schooling must receive accurate information and the process must be transparently fair; the more sophisticated parents must have no special advantage.

Just as high school guidance counselors commonly recommend that students apply to more than one college and include some less-competitive selections, to assure that they get in somewhere, so information center staff encourage parents to distribute their preferences sensibly among school that they find acceptable.

The process of making assignments does not discourage parents from selecting a very popular school as their first choice. Here's how it works. The applications of students eligible to apply for ninth grade, for example, are assigned random numbers, and each is dealt with in turn. Those with low numbers are assured of assignment to their first-choice schools, unless the places available have been filled by applicants with even lower random numbers.

If an applicant's first-choice school has been filled, the assignment program checks whether space is available in the second-choice school, and so on through the options indicated. There is thus no advantage to **not** selecting a popular school as first or second choice, since that will not affect chances of getting into a third-choice school: each applicant is dealt with in turn until the attempt has been made to make an assignment based upon all of her/his preferences indicated on the application.

Perhaps one student in five does not receive an assignment in the first round; none receive an involuntary assignment. An applicant with a high random number who has selected only the more popular schools may receive no assignment in the first round (generally in April). The parents are contacted and encouraged to make a new selection of schools, since those they had requested are now full. They may request to be placed on the waiting list for one or two of the original choices, but they are also counseled about which schools still have space available. During the summer months, the parent information centers are able to issue assignments on the spot to parents who select a school with space. If a parent does not eventually select a school with space available, the student will be assigned to the school nearest where he or she lives that does have space.

23. What about transportation issues in a system of school choice?

There are two issues with transportation associated with choice of schools: who should pay for it? and, how can the cost be kept reasonable?

Most school systems provide free transportation to students who live over a stated distance from the school to which they are assigned; often the state participates in the cost. Transportation may also be provided free when there are special hazards which make it inadvisable for children to walk to a school.

Parents who take advantage of permissive transfer policies are ordinarily responsible for the associated transportation costs. Parents whose children are given a special assignment because of some program which is not offered at their "regular" school--for example, for deaf children, or for children requiring English as a

Second Language--are usually provided with free transportation.

What about programs which set out to encourage diversity and parent choice? A case could be made for applying either set of rules, but the second has the stronger arguments. To provide a choice of public schools as a deliberate policy decision without providing free transportation can only lead to unequal opportunities for children based upon the ability of their parents to get them to school at their own expense. The whole trend of public policy in education over recent decades has been systematically to remove such barriers to participation.

An additional consideration is that schools that are encouraged to become more diverse, more uniquely flavorful, may become less suitable for certain students. Instead of a lowest common denominator, such a school seeks to offer a program highly responsive to **some** students, which inevitably means less appropriate for some other students. The more effective such a school becomes for some, the less effective it may be for others. Parents must have a right to select **out of** as well as **into** a truly distinctive public school of choice. This right is meaningless unless free transportation is provided.

This is why a school system or a state should not enter into a program of promoting choice absent-mindedly, as most have drifted into allowing choice when parents press for it in specific instances. There are public as well as private costs associated with the exercise of choice, and it should be promoted only under conditions which assure that the public and private **benefits** outweigh costs.

The cost of transportation can be held down in several ways, in addition to those associated with sound public management. For example, recruitment for a particular school can be concentrated in its own neighborhood and in **one** other (preferably of a contrasting racial or economic character) so that students will come by the bus-load rather than the taxi-load!

24. What is the role of state government in supporting and regulating school choice?

Education is the work of schools, not of government. We have become confused about this because most of our schools "belong" to local government, though the instinct of Americans has been to avoid making education a branch of municipal administration like roads or sewers or social services. Elected school boards are generally, at least in theory, non-partisan.

Government oversees schools to guarantee justice--and justice requires that every student receive an effective basic education--but government itself does not educate. Thus government needs to respect the distinctive responsibility of schools to determine how the goals of basic education--and the other goals which are distinctive to each school--will be achieved. At the same time, it needs to define clearly what is expected of every school.

The trend of recent education reform legislation toward increased requirements is actually helpful to the extension of choice if it focuses upon outcomes. It is harmful if it defines too closely the procedures and curricula which must be followed.

In general, it has been local authorities, not states, which have developed detailed requirements about how schools will go about the business of education. The model followed has been one of managerial rationality and uniformity, often justified in the name of assuring an equal opportunity for all students. This is a serious barrier to the diversity that makes parent choice meaningful--and to real improvement of education through school-level initiative and accountability.

States can take some of the pressure off local authorities to control what schools do day by day, by setting objective standards of what schools should help their students to achieve over time.

Government's responsibility for educational justice also includes assuring that students are not discriminated against in obtaining educational benefits. There is no question that this calls for more subtle judgments as schools become more diverse, and as students do not attend them by the automatic operation of residential attendance zones but by choice.

Massachusetts has found it necessary, in the interest of equity as well as sound planning, to insist that programs of public school choice operate within the framework of comprehensive local educational equity plans, developed by each school system with state department of education assistance and ultimate approval.

Last but of course not least, state government may decide to include incentives (or at least provision) for increased school diversity in its funding for the improvement of education. At very least it will want to assure that such funding does not create a pressure toward increased uniformity, and so discourage teacher initiative and the flavorful schooling that make choice worth-while.

*****

1. Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education, Washington: National Governors' Association 1986, page 4.

2. Arthur G. Powell, Eleanor Farrar and David K. Cohen, The Shopping Mall High School, Boston: Houghton Mifflin 1985, page 310.

3. Charles L. Glenn, The Boston/Chelsea Urban Team: After One Year, Quincy, MA: Massachusetts Department of Education, October 1990.

4. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century, New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy 1986, pages 57-58.